

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	I	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/717,596		11/21/2003	Ayae Endo	117625	8683	
25944	7590	05/26/2006		EXAMINER		
OLIFF & E	BERRID	GE, PLC		GARRETT, DAWN L		
P.O. BOX 1 ALEXAND		22320		EXAMINER GARRETT, DAWN L	PAPER NUMBER	
,				1774		
				DATE MAILED: 05/26/200	6	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			./					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)						
	10/717,596	ENDO ET AL.						
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit						
	Dawn Garrett	1774						
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence address						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Description of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUN .136(a). In no event, however, may a d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO te, cause the application to become A	ICATION. I reply be timely filed INTHS from the mailing date of this communic ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).						
Status								
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 I	<u>March 2006</u> .							
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ Thi	<u> </u>							
3) Since this application is in condition for allowed	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims								
4) Claim(s) <u>1-10,18-21,27-29,34,37 and 38</u> is/ar	e pending in the application	on.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra								
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-10,18-21,27-29,34,37 and 38</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.							
Application Papers								
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin	ier.							
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 21 November 2003 is/	/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)[	objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the								
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E								
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119								
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of:	n priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
1.⊠ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.								
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No								
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage								
application from the International Burea	au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	st of the certified copies no	t received.						
Attachment(s)								
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)						
<ul> <li>2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1-31-2006.</li> </ul>		o(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)						

Art Unit: 1774

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

- 1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on March 28, 2006 has been entered.
- 2. Claims 1, 18, 19, 27, and 29 were amended. Claims 11-17, 22-26, 30-33 35 and 36 are canceled. Claims 1-10, 18-21, 27-29, 34, 37 and 38 are pending.
- 3. The rejection of claims 1-6, 8-10, 18-21, 27-29, 34, 37 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Li (US 6,372,154) is withdrawn due to the amendment.
- 4. The rejection of claims 1-10, 18-21, 27-29, 34, 37 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lamansky et al. (US 2004/0062947) is withdrawn due to the amendment.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
  - The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
- 6. Claims 1-10, 18-21, 27-29, 34, 37, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. While the specification provides support for a metal

Art Unit: 1774

deactivator in a range of 0.1 to 10 percent by weight relative to a hole injection or luminescent layer, it is not seen where the specification provides support for this weight range relative to "a functional element". Accordingly, the new limitation comprising the percent by weight relative to a functional element is considered to be new matter.

- 7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
  The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 8. Claims 1-10, 27-29, 34, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Independent claims 1, 27, and 29 set forth a weight range relative to a functional element. Since a functional element is not expressly set forth previously in the claim, the "functional element" is considered to be indefinite. It is not clear if the functional element is something already recited in the claim or if it is a separate component. The amount of metal activator is unclear since the "functional element" limitation is undefined.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 10. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cantor (US 6,080,450). Cantor discloses a composition comprising 0.1 % Irganox MD 1024, which is the same metal deactivator set forth in the present specification and inherently has the

Art Unit: 1774

same properties as the material disclosed by applicant (see Cantor, col. 5, "Formulation A"). The formulation comprises organic compounds per the organic functional material of claim 2. An oligomer and acrylate are disclosed per the macromolecule of claim 4. Since claim 5 is drawn to a composition not an electroluminescent element, the organic compounds of the composition meet the claim limitation.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 12. Claims 1-6, 8-10, 18-21, 27-29, 34, 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li (US 6,372,154). Li discloses a luminescent ink composition comprising a luminescent organic compound ("solute"), an inert solvent ("solvent") and a functional additive ("metal deactivator") with regard to claim 1 (see claim 1, col. 15) that are used to form an electroluminescent device (see abstract). The organic luminescent molecule may be a macromolecule such as distyrylbenzene (see claim 3, col. 15) with regard to claim 4. Li discloses the functional additive ("metal deactivator") may comprise triazoles (see claim 9, col. 15). Triazoles are disclosed by applicant in par. 11 of the present specification as metal deactivators. Since Li discloses the same material, triazoles, as applicant, the materials are considered to have the same transparency and color properties as those claimed by applicant with regard to claims 8 and 9. Similarly, since the materials disclosed by Li are the same as those specified by applicant, the solubility properties of claim 10 are also deemed to be met in the

Art Unit: 1774

disclosure by Li. With regard to claim 29, the devices comprise multiple layers (see col. 12, lines 62-67). Li teaches the functional additives (such as the triazoles) are added in an amount of 0.5-40 weight percent (see col. 2, lines 44-62). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have selected any triazole derivative, including those specifically mentioned in the present specification in the amount of 0.5-40 weight percent, because Li generally teaches triazoles are suitable as a functional additive for the device.

## Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### Conclusion

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dawn Garrett whose telephone number is (571) 272-1523. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye can be reached at (571) 272-3186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1774

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Dawn Garrett
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1774

D.G. May 23, 2006